arXiv:1606.07257v2 [math.AG] 27 Jun 2016

Prehomogeneous tensor spaces

Federico Venturelli

Abstract

We refine the classification of prehomogeneous vector spaces provided by Sato-Kimura in the case of tensor spaces, presenting a quick way to check whether a given tensor space is prehomogeneous or not.

Introduction

The group $GL_{a_1}(\mathbb{C}) \times \cdots \times GL_{a_n}(\mathbb{C})$ acts naturally on $\mathbb{C}^{a_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_n}$: our goal is to determine for which $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ the above tensor space is prehomogeneous. We will assume $n \geq 3$, otherwise the problem is trivial.

In 1977 Sato and Kimura obtained a classification of prehomogeneous vector spaces, also covering the case of tensor spaces, based on *castling transform*; in the case of $\mathbb{C}^{a_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_n}$, this transform can be read as

$$(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \sim (a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}, \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i - a_n)$$

where the n-uple $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ represents the space $\mathbb{C}^{a_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_n}$.

The classification obtained by Sato and Kimura in the case of tensor products can be expressed as follows:

Theorem (Sato-Kimura)**.**

1. *Each castling-equivalence class contains a unique minimal element.*
2. *Any irreducible prehomogeneous tensor product is castling-equivalent to either*
   - *(a)* $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ *with* $\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i \leq a_n$.
   - *(b)* $(2, 2, 2)$ *or* $(2, 3, 3)$.

It is not easy to use Sato-Kimura's theorem since, a priori, one needs to apply castling transform several times: to give an example, $(3, 35, 92)$ is castling-equivalent to $(3, 13, 35)$ which is in turn castling-equivalent to $(3, 4, 13)$; the latter space falls in the category 2)-(a) of Sato-Kimura's theorem, and as such is prehomogeneous.

Our result allows to detect in a simpler way when $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is prehomogeneous: we define the value

$$N(a_1,\dots,a_n)=\sum_{i=1}^{n}(a_i^2-1)-(\prod_{i=1}^{n}a_i-1)$$

Notice that N is invariant under castling transform (see proposition 1.5) and that $N(2,k,k)=2$, $N(2,k,k+1)=3$. What we obtain is that:

Theorem 1. *Let $n\geq 3$ and $a_1,\dots,a_n\in\mathbb{N}$:*

1. *If $N(a_1,\dots,a_n)\leq -1$ then $(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ is not prehomogeneous.*
2. *If $N(a_1,\dots,a_n)=0$ or $N(a_1,\dots,a_n)=1$ then $(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ is prehomogeneous.*
3. *If $N(a_1,\dots,a_n)=2$ then $(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ is castling-equivalent to either a minimal space $(a'_1,\dots,a'_n)$ with $n\geq 4$ whose smallest element is at least 2, in which case $(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ is prehomogeneous, or to a minimal space of type $(1,\dots,1,2,k,k)$ for a unique $k\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$, in which case $(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ is prehomogeneous if and only if $k\leq 3$.*
4. *If $N(a_1,\dots,a_n)\geq 3$ then $(a_1,\dots,a_n)$ is prehomogeneous.*

The theorem shows that castling transform is needed only when $N(a_1,\dots,a_n)=2$. Referring back to the previous example, since $N(3,35,92)=36$ we can immediately conclude that $(3,35,92)$ is prehomogeneous.

Our paper is structured as follows:

1. A brief introduction on castling transform and group actions, including an important result by Kac.
2. The proof of theorem 1 for $n=3$. Another proof of this case, carried out in a different way, already appeared in Weyman's notes [Wey] (up to a few misprints).
3. The proof of theorem 1 in the general case.

For basic facts about prehomogeneous vector spaces and for the tensor product case we found very useful the notes [Man]; the suggestion of using Kac's theorem 1.6 to investigate the prehomogeneity of tensor spaces came from G. Ottaviani.

1 Castling transform and group actions

Definition 1.1. Let G be an affine algebraic group and V be a G-module; V is said *prehomogeneous* if it contains a dense orbit for the action of G (with respect to the Zariski topology).

Remark 1. Let G be an affine algebraic group acting on an irreducible algebraic variety X, and define d_m as $d_m=\min_{x\in X}\{dim(G_x)\}$, where G_x is the isotropy group of x; in order for X to be prehomogeneous, the following necessary condition has to be satisfied:

$$dim(G)-d_m\geq dim(X) \tag{1.1}$$

There is also a sufficient condition for the prehomogeneity of a vector space, although it is a fairly weak one:

Proposition 1.1. *Let V be a G-module of dimension n and m be an integer; if $m \geq n$ then $V \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$ is prehomogeneous for the action of $G \times GL_m(\mathbb{C})$, defined on decomposable tensors by*

$$(G \times GL_m(\mathbb{C})) \times (V \otimes \mathbb{C}^m) \longrightarrow V \otimes \mathbb{C}^m \ \mid \ ((g, A), v \otimes u) \to (g \cdot v) \otimes Au$$

Proof. Let $\rho : G \to GL(V)$ be the linear map describing the action of G on V; since $V \otimes \mathbb{C}^m \simeq Hom(V^*, \mathbb{C}^m) \simeq M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{C})$, if $B \in \rho(G)$, $A \in GL_m(\mathbb{C})$ and $M \in V \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$ the action of $G \times GL_m(\mathbb{C})$ can be rewritten as follows:

$$(\rho(G) \times GL_m(\mathbb{C})) \times Hom(V^*, \mathbb{C}^m) \longrightarrow Hom(V^*, \mathbb{C}^m) \ \mid \ ((B, A), M) \to AMB^t$$

Since $m \geq n$, if M has maximum rank it can be reduced to the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & & & \\ & \ddots & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & 1 \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

simply by multiplying it on the left by a suitable matrix A; this means that matrices of maximum rank, which are a dense open subset of $M_{m \times n}(\mathbb{C})$, form an orbit of the action. □

Corollary 1.2. *Let $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{N}$; if $a_j \geq \prod_{i \neq j} a_i$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ then $\mathbb{C}^{a_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_n}$ is prehomogeneous for the action of $GL_{a_1}(\mathbb{C}) \times \dots \times GL_{a_n}(\mathbb{C})$.*

Proof. It follows immediately from the previous proposition ($V = \bigotimes_{i \neq j} \mathbb{C}^{a_i}$, $G = \prod_{i \neq j} GL_{a_i}(\mathbb{C})$, $m = a_j$). □

Starting from a prehomogeneous G-module V, castling transform allows to find possibly infinitely many other prehomogeneous vector spaces; it works as described in the following proposition, whose proof can be found in [Man, prop. 28].

Proposition 1.3. *Let V be a G-module of dimension n and p, q be non-negative integers such that $p + q = n$; then $V \otimes \mathbb{C}^p$ is prehomogeneous for the action of $G \times GL_p(\mathbb{C})$ if and only if $V^* \otimes \mathbb{C}^q$ is prehomogeneous for the action of $G \times GL_q(\mathbb{C})$.*

Let us give an example of how castling transform works in the situation we will focus on in this article, i.e. when the group $G = GL_{a_1}(\mathbb{C}) \times \cdots \times GL_{a_n}(\mathbb{C})$ acts on the vector space $V = \mathbb{C}^{a_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_n}$. Assume the G-module V is prehomogeneous, and pick $n-1$ numbers a_i (say the first $n-1$ ones, for simplicity); if we call $p = a_n$ and $q = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i - a_n$, as long as $q \geq 0$ the previous proposition grants that $(\mathbb{C}^{a_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_{n-1}})^* \otimes \mathbb{C}^q \simeq \mathbb{C}^{a_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_{n-1}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^q$ is prehomogeneous for the action of $GL_{a_1}(\mathbb{C}) \times \cdots \times GL_{a_{n-1}}(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_q(\mathbb{C})$.

Remark 2. From now on we will represent the space $\mathbb{C}^{a_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_n}$ with the n-uple $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$, and we will speak indifferently of prehomogeneous n-uples $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ or prehomogeneous vector spaces $\mathbb{C}^{a_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_n}$.

Thus, starting from a prehomogeneous n-uple $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ we can obtain a 'tree' of prehomogeneous n-uples related to $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ by castling transform (we will say they are *castling-equivalent*); to give an example, assume that $n = 3$ and that (a, b, c) is prehomogeneous: the corresponding castling tree is



of course provided all the elements of a given triplet are non-negative (we could also disregard trivial prehomogeneous n-uples, i.e. those in which at least one element is 0).

The fact that castling-equivalent vector spaces can be arranged in trees, and not just in graphs with possibly more than one minimal element, follows from this proposition (again, see [Man, prop. 29] for a proof):

Proposition 1.4. *Every castling-equivalence class contains a unique element of minimal dimension, up to duality.*

Remark 3. Clearly $\mathbb{C}^{a_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_n}$ is prehomogeneous for the action of $GL_{a_1}(\mathbb{C}) \times \cdots \times GL_{a_n}(\mathbb{C})$ if and only if $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^{a_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_n})$ is prehomogeneous for the action of $SL_{a_1}(\mathbb{C}) \times \cdots \times SL_{a_n}(\mathbb{C})$. The generic isotropy group $H = \{(\lambda_1 I_1, \ldots, \lambda_n I_n) | \lambda_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot \lambda_n = 1\} \subset G$ we have in the affine setting becomes trivial in the projective setting, thus the necessary condition to be satisfied for our space to be prehomogeneous becomes

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}(a_i^2-1)-(\prod_{i=1}^{n}a_i-1)\geq 0$$

The previous remark suggests that we investigate the prehomogeneity of $(a_1,\ldots,a_n)$ looking at the value

$$N(a_1,\ldots,a_n)=\sum_{i=1}^{n}(a_i^2-1)-(\prod_{i=1}^{n}a_i-1)=\sum_{i=1}^{n}a_i^2-\prod_{i=1}^{n}a_i-n+1 \tag{1.2}$$

This approach is also 'consistent' with castling transform, since

Proposition 1.5. *If $(a_1,\ldots,a_n)$ and $(b_1,\ldots,b_n)$ are castling-equivalent, then $N(a_1,\ldots,a_n)=N(b_1,\ldots,b_n)$.*

Proof. It is enough to prove the statement for n-uples related by a single castling transform, so we can assume (without loss of generality) $a_i=b_i$ for $i=1,\ldots,n-1$ and $b_n=\prod_{i=1}^{n-1}a_i-a_n$; we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}N(b_1,\ldots,b_n)&=\sum_{i=1}^{n-1}a_i^2+a_n^2+(a_1\cdot\ldots\cdot a_{n-1})^2-2a_1\cdot\ldots\cdot a_n-\\&-(\prod_{i=1}^{n-1}a_i)(a_1\cdot\ldots\cdot a_{n-1}-a_n)-n+1=\sum_{i=1}^{n}a_i^2-\prod_{i=1}^{n}a_i-n+1=\\&=N(a_1,\ldots,a_n)\end{aligned}$$

□

Notice that the converse of proposition 1.5 does not hold: $(1,1,3)$ and $(2,2,4)$ are not castling-equivalent, but $N(1,1,3)=N(2,2,4)=6$.

1.1 Kac's theorem

Pick a natural number $c\geq 2$ and define the numbers a_i as follows:

$$\begin{cases}a_0=0\\a_1=1\\a_i=ca_{i-1}-a_{i-2}\end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

If $c=2$ the a_i are just all natural numbers together with 0, while for $c=3$ we obtain Fibonacci numbers of odd position. A theorem by Kac states that any generic element of $\mathbb{C}^c\otimes\mathbb{C}^b\otimes\mathbb{C}^a$, where $2\leq c\leq b\leq a$, can be reduced to a canonical form under the action of $GL_b(\mathbb{C})\times GL_a(\mathbb{C})$ provided a,b,c satisfy a certain relation:

Theorem 1.6 (Kac)**.** *Let $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2 \leq c \leq b \leq a$ and*

$$a^2 + b^2 - abc \geq 1 \tag{1.4}$$

Then there exist unique $n, m, i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} b = na_i + ma_{i+1} \\ a = na_{i+1} + ma_{i+2} \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

such that any generic tensor in $\mathbb{C}^c \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^a$ decomposes via the action of $GL_b(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_a(\mathbb{C})$ in n blocks of dimension $c \times a_i \times a_{i+1}$ and m blocks of dimension $c \times a_{i+1} \times a_{i+2}$, which are said Fibonacci blocks.

For example, any generic element of $(3, 10, 27)$ decomposes in one block of dimension $3 \times 1 \times 3$ and three blocks of dimension $3 \times 3 \times 8$, while any generic tensor of $(3, 4, 13)$ decomposes in four blocks of dimension $3 \times 1 \times 3$ and one block of dimension $3 \times 0 \times 1$ (i.e. an empty block).

Remark 4. Kac's original proof was carried out in the setting of quiver representation theory (see [Kac]); this subject is not directly related to the problem of prehomogeneity of vector spaces, but it is possible to prove that castling transform works on vector spaces exactly as reflection functors do on quiver representations (see [BGP] and [KR]). Since this paper does not need any other tool provided by quiver representation theory, we will not show the proof of Kac's theorem; an alternative proof of the theorem, which uses the vector bundles language, can be found in [Bra].

The importance of Kac's theorem for this paper is explained by the next proposition.

Proposition 1.7. *Let $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2 \leq c \leq b \leq a$ and (1.4) is satisfied; then (a, b, c) is prehomogeneous.*

In order to prove it we need a lemma.

Lemma 1.8. *$\mathbb{C}^c \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_i} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_{i+1}}$, where the a_i are defined by (1.3), is prehomogeneous for the action of $GL_{a_i}(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_{a_{i+1}}(\mathbb{C})$ (i.e. Fibonacci blocks are prehomogeneous).*

Proof. By induction on i. If $i = 1$ then $a_i = 1$ and $a_{i+1} = c$, and clearly $\mathbb{C}^c \otimes \mathbb{C}^c \simeq \mathbb{C}^c \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{C}^c$ is prehomogeneous for the action of $GL_1(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_c(\mathbb{C})$. Assume now $i \geq 2$: $\mathbb{C}^c \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_i} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_{i+1}}$ is prehomogeneous for the action of $GL_{a_i}(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_{a_{i+1}}(\mathbb{C})$ (by inductive hypothesis), hence if we call $V = \mathbb{C}^c \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_{i+1}}$, $G = GL_{a_{i+1}}(\mathbb{C})$, $p = a_i$ and $q = ca_{i+1} - a_i = a_{i+2}$, proposition 1.3 grants us that $V^* \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_{i+2}} \simeq \mathbb{C}^c \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_{i+1}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{a_{i+2}}$ is prehomogeneous for the action of $G \times GL_{a_{i+2}}(\mathbb{C}) = GL_{a_{i+1}}(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_{a_{i+2}}(\mathbb{C})$. □

We can now prove proposition 1.7:

Proof. Using theorem 1.6 we can say there are unique $n, m, i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $b = na_i + ma_{i+1}$ and $a = na_{i+1} + ma_{i+2}$, and any element of $\mathbb{C}^c \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^a$ not belonging to some closed subset U decomposes under the action of $GL_b(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_a(\mathbb{C})$ in n blocks of

dimension $c\times a_i\times a_{i+1}$ and m blocks of dimension $c\times a_{i+1}\times a_{i+2}$; the previous lemma shows these blocks are prehomogeneous for the action of, respectively, $GL_{a_i}(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_{a_{i+1}}(\mathbb{C})$ and $GL_{a_{i+1}}(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_{a_{i+2}}(\mathbb{C})$.

Call $V \subset \mathbb{C}^c\otimes\mathbb{C}^b\otimes\mathbb{C}^a - U$ the subspace containing tensors made of Fibonacci blocks, and $W \subset \mathbb{C}^c\otimes\mathbb{C}^b\otimes\mathbb{C}^a$ the subset obtained by acting on V with $GL_b(\mathbb{C})\times GL_a(\mathbb{C})$; clearly $V \subseteq W \subseteq \mathbb{C}^c \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^a - U$. Since any single Fibonacci block is prehomogeneous for the action of the corresponding $GL_{a_i}(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_{a_{i+1}}(\mathbb{C})$, the elements of $GL_b(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_a(\mathbb{C})$ made of blocks themselves act transitively on V, which means $GL_b(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_a(\mathbb{C})$ acts transitively on all of W.

Consider now two tensors $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^c \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^a - U$; the action of suitable elements $g, h \in GL_b(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_a(\mathbb{C})$ will turn them into tensors $\overline{x}, \overline{y} \in V$ (by theorem 1.6); since $V \subseteq W$, the action of $GL_b(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_a(\mathbb{C})$ can turn $\overline{x}$ into $\overline{y}$ (and vice-versa). This means $\mathbb{C}^c \otimes \mathbb{C}^b \otimes \mathbb{C}^a - U$ is a dense orbit for the action of $GL_b(\mathbb{C}) \times GL_a(\mathbb{C})$. □

Kac's theorem thus gives us a much stronger sufficient condition for the prehomogeneity of an n-uple $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$. Assume there are elements a_{i_1} and a_{i_2} in the n-uple which are both bigger than (or equal to) the product q of the remaining $n-2$ elements a_i: if $q \geq 2$ and (q, a_{i_1}, a_{i_2}) satisfies (1.4), the n-uple $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is prehomogeneous. As we shall see, Kac's theorem is crucial when $n = 3$.

1.2 Weierstrass' form

The following result dates back to Weierstrass, but we will give a partial proof of it for the convenience of the reader.

Proposition 1.9. $(2, k, k)$ *is prehomogeneous* $\iff k \leq 3$.

The implication $\Leftarrow$ is well known. Indeed, for $k = 2, 3$ the space $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^k \otimes \mathbb{C}^k$ has finitely many orbits (for a complete classification of such spaces see [Par1] and [Par2], or the table at page 90 of [Man]).

Proof. If $Span\{e_1, e_1\} = \mathbb{C}^2$, any element x in $(2, k, k)$ can be expressed as a matrix pencil as $x = e_1A+e_2B$, where $A, B \in M_n(\mathbb{C})$ (they are the two 'slices' of the element x). When viewing tensors of $(2, k, k)$ in this way, the action of the group $GL_2(\mathbb{C})\times GL_k(\mathbb{C})\times GL_k(\mathbb{C})$ can be read as

$$(L, M, N) \cdot (e_1A + e_2B) = M(e_1\overline{A} + e_2\overline{B})N^t \quad for \;\; L \in GL_2(\mathbb{C}) \;\; and \;\; M, N \in GL_k(\mathbb{C})$$

where $\overline{A} = l_{11}A + l_{12}B$ and $\overline{B} = l_{21}A + l_{22}B$.
Assume A to be invertible and B to be diagonalizable, i.e.

$$A \in GL_n(\mathbb{C}) \;\; and \;\; A^{-1}B = G^{-1}DG \;\; \exists G \in GL_n(\mathbb{C}), \exists D \in M_n(\mathbb{C}) \;\; diagonal \qquad (1.6)$$

Under these hypotheses, if we call y the tensor which is represented as $e_1I_n + e_2D$ we can write:

$$x = e_1A + e_2B = A(e_1I_n + e_2A^{-1}B) = A(e_1I_n + e_2G^{-1}DG) =$$
$$= A(e_1G^{-1}G + e_2G^{-1}DG) = AG^{-1}(e_1I_n + e_2D)G = (I_2, AG^{-1}, G^t) \cdot y$$

This means that x belongs to the same orbit as y, which implies x and y have isotropy groups of the same dimension; since G_y contains all elements of the form $(\alpha I_2, \alpha^{-1}\beta D, \beta^{-1}D^{-1})$ where D is diagonal, i.e. all elements of the form $(\alpha I_2, C, C^{-1})$ where C is diagonal, we have $dim(G_x) = dim(G_y) \geq n + 1$.

Both invertible and diagonalizable matrices are a dense open subset of $M_n(\mathbb{C})$, so the tensors in $(2, n, n)$ which *do not* satisfy the hypotheses (1.6) have isotropy groups of dimension at least equal to that of isotropy groups of elements in $(2, k, k)$ which satisfy (1.6). As a consequence, for $(2, k, k)$ we have $d_m = n + 1$ and so the necessary condition for prehomogeneity becomes

$$4 + 2n^2 - (n + 1) \geq 2n^2 \iff n \leq 3$$

□

Of course something similar holds for n-uples:

Corollary 1.10. *The n-uples $(1, \ldots, 1, 2, k, k)$ are prehomogeneous $\iff k \leq 3$.*

2 The case $n = 3$

Combining explicit computation (via Macaulay2) and castling transform, it turns out that the triplets $(2, k, k)$ with $k \geq 4$ (and those castling-equivalent to them) are the sole non-prehomogeneous triplets which satisfy the necessary condition

$$N(a, b, c) \geq 0 \tag{2.1}$$

As we shall see, this necessary condition is in most cases also sufficient.

Proposition 2.1. *If $N(a, b, c) = 0$ then $(a, b, c) = (1, 1, 1)$.*

Proof. Assume two elements of the triplet (a, b, c) are equal, say $b = c$: in this case we'd have $a^2 + 2b^2 - ab^2 - 2 = 0$ i.e. $b^2(2 - a) = 2 - a^2$ which gives $b = \sqrt{2 + a - \frac{2}{(2-a)}}$. The only $a \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ is $a = 1$, which gives $b = 1$ too: this means $(a, b, c) = (1, 1, 1)$.

But what if $a \neq b \neq c \neq a$? Assume, without loss of generality, $a < b < c$: we will now prove that *there exist (a', b', c') castling-equivalent to (a, b, c) such that $N(a', b', c') = 0$ and $\underline{0} < (a', b', c') < (a, b, c)$.*

Define $\phi(x) = x^2 - abx + a^2 + b^2 - 2$: c is a root of $\phi(x)$, the other one being some c' satisfying $cc' = a^2 + b^2 - 2$ and $c + c' = ab$; the former equality shows that c' is positive, while the latter tells us that c is an integer and that (a, b, c) and (a, b, c') are castling-equivalent. This means $c \in \mathbb{N}$ and, by proposition 1.5, $N(a, b, c') = 0$ too.

If we factorize $\phi(x)$ using the roots c and c' and then evaluate it in b we obtain

$$\phi(b) = (b-c)(b-c') = b^2(2-a) + a^2 - 2$$

Under our assumptions $\phi(b) < 0$, unless $a = 1, 2$; let us check what happens in these cases.

If $a = 1$, b and c satisfy $b^2 + c^2 - bc - 1 = 0$ i.e. $(b-c)^2 + bc = 1$, and the only solution of this equation is given by $b = c = 1$ (contradiction). If $a = 2$, b and c satisfy $b^2 + c^2 - 2bc + 2 = 0$ i.e. $(b-c)^2 = -2$, which clearly cannot be.

Thus we can say $\phi(b) = (b-c)(b-c') < 0$, and since $c > b$ we must conclude $b > c' > 0$; this means $\underline{0} < (a, b, c') < (a, b, c)$, and so our claim is proved.

We now have all we need to prove the proposition: starting from a triplet (a, b, c) such that $N(a, b, c) = 0$ we can follow these steps:

1. Check whether $a \neq b \neq c \neq a$.
2. If the answer to 1) is 'no', then at least two elements of (a, b, c) are equal, and this means $(a, b, c) = (1, 1, 1)$; in this case we stop.
3. If the answer to 1) is 'yes', as we have just shown we can find a triplet (a', b', c') castling-equivalent to (a, b, c) such that $\underline{0} < (a', b', c') < (a, b, c)$ and $N(a', b', c') = 0$; in this case we start over from 1) using (a', b', c').

Since the condition $\underline{0} < (a', b', c') < (a, b, c)$ grants termination to the previous 'algorithm', and since termination can only happen when we start from point 1) with the triplet $(1, 1, 1)$, what we have proved is that all (a, b, c) such that $N(a, b, c) = 0$ are castling-equivalent to $(1, 1, 1)$; since all triplets that are castling-equivalent to $(1, 1, 1)$ do not belong to $\mathbb{N}^3$, the proposition is proved. □

As a corollary, we obtain that

Corollary 2.2. *The triplets (a, b, c) such that $N(a, b, c) = 0$ are prehomogeneous.*

Proposition 2.3. *There are no triplets (a, b, c) such that $N(a, b, c) = n$ for $n = 1 + 9k$ or $n = 4 + 9k$ (with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$).*

Proof. The equation $N(a, b, c) = n$ becomes, mod 3,

$$a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - abc \equiv 0 \tag{2.2}$$

which can be solved in integers only for $a, b, c \equiv 0$ as the following table shows:

$(a,b,c) \equiv$	$N(a,b,c) \equiv$
$(0,0,0)$	0
$(0,0,1)$	1
$(0,0,2)$	1
$(0,1,1)$	2
$(0,1,2)$	2
$(0,2,2)$	2
$(1,1,1)$	2
$(1,1,2)$	1
$(1,2,2)$	2
$(2,2,2)$	2

This means the only possible solutions of $N(a,b,c) = n$ have the form $(a,b,c) = (3\alpha, 3\beta, 3\gamma)$ for some $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}$; but if we substitute such a triplet in the equation $N(a,b,c) = n$, it becomes

$$3(\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + \gamma^2) - 9\alpha\beta\gamma - 3k = \sigma$$

where $\sigma = 1$ if $n = 1 + 9k$ and $\sigma = 2$ if $n = 4 + 9k$. Since the left-hand side is a multiple of three but the right-hand side is not, our equation has no solutions. □

We have $N(2,k,k) = 2$, and for $k \geq 4$ these triplets are not prehomogeneous; these are the only minimal triplets such that $N(a,b,c) = 2$ that are not prehomogeneous, since:

Proposition 2.4. *If $N(a,b,c) = 2$ then (a,b,c) is castling-equivalent to $(2,k,k)$ for a unique $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$; in particular (a,b,c) is prehomogeneous if and only if $k \leq 3$.*

Proof. The last part of the proposition follows from proposition 1.9; we only have to prove the first part.

If $b = c$ we have $a^2 + 2b^2 - ab^2 = 4$ i.e. $a = \frac{1}{2}(b^2 \pm \sqrt{b^4 - 8b^2 + 16})$ which means that a is either 2 or $b^2 - 2$; thus our triplet is $(2,b,b)$ or (b,b,b^2-2) (notice how these triplets are castling-equivalent, once we fix b).

Assume now $a \neq b \neq c \neq a$ and, without loss of generality, $a < b < c$; we will prove that *there is a triplet (a',b',c') castling-equivalent to (a,b,c) such that $N(a',b',c') = 2$ and $\underline{0} < (a',b',c') < (a,b,c)$.*

Since $N(a,b,c) = 2$, c is a root of $\phi(x) = x^2 - abx + a^2 + b^2 - 4$, the other one being c' which satisfies $c' = ab - c$ and $cc' = a^2 + b^2 - 4$; what this means is that c' is a positive integer, that $N(a,b,c') = 2$ and that (a,b,c) and (a,b,c') are castling-equivalent.

If we factorize $\phi(x)$ using c and c' and evaluate it in b, we obtain

$$\phi(b) = (b-c)(b-c') = b^2(2-a) + a^2 - 4$$

The value on the right-hand side of the previous equality is strictly negative under our hypotheses. In fact $\phi(b) < 0$ if and only if $2 < a < b^2 - 2$; since $a < b$ we also have $a < b^2 - 2$, provided $b^2 - 2 \geq b$ (which is true unless $b = 0$ or $b = 1$, with both these

cases excluded by hypothesis). Moreover, if we had $a = 2$ then b and c would satisfy $b^2 + c^2 - 2bc = 0$ i.e. $(b-c)^2 = 0$ and we'd obtain $b = c$ (contradiction); if we had $a = 1$ instead, b and c would satisfy $b^2 + c^2 - bc - 3 = 0$ i.e. $(b-c)^2 + bc = 3$ which is impossible because $c > b \geq 2$. We can conclude that $\phi(b) < 0$.

Since $c > b$, $\phi(b) < 0$ means $c' < b$ which implies $\underline{0} < (a, b, c') < (a, b, c)$; our claim is thus proved. This means that starting from a triplet (a, b, c) such that $N(a, b, c) = 2$ we can follow these steps:

1. Check whether $a \neq b \neq c \neq a$.

2. If the answer to 1) is 'no', then at least two elements of (a, b, c) are equal, and this means $(a, b, c) = (2, k, k)$ or $(a, b, c) = (k, k, k^2 - 2)$ for a unique $k \in \mathbb{N}$; in this case we stop.

3. If the answer to 1) is 'yes', as we have just shown we can find a triplet (a', b', c') castling-equivalent to (a, b, c) such that $\underline{0} < (a', b', c') < (a, b, c)$ and $N(a', b', c') = 2$; in this case we start over from 1) using (a', b', c').

Since the condition $\underline{0} < (a', b', c') < (a, b, c)$ grants termination to the previous 'algorithm', and since termination can only happen when we start from point 1) with triplets of the form $(2, k, k)$ or $(k, k, k^2 - 2)$ (which are castling-equivalent), the proposition is proved. □

With this same 'infinite descent' method we can find all minimal triplets such that $N(a, b, c) = m$ for any value of $m \in \mathbb{Z}$: for example, $N(a, b, c) = 3$ gives the minimal triplet $(1, 2, 2)$ while $N(a, b, c) = 6$ gives the minimal triplets $(1, 1, 3)$ and $(2, 2, 4)$. We identified minimal triplets for a lot of values $m \geq 3$ and noticed that either they contain a 1 (and so they are trivially prehomogeneous) or they satisfy Kac's inequality (1.4) (and so they are prehomogeneous by proposition 1.7). The following proposition shows that this is no coincidence, but first we need a lemma:

Lemma 2.5. *Assume $N(a, b, c) \geq 3$ and (without loss of generality) $2 \leq a \leq b \leq c$; then $ab \leq 2c$.*

Proof. We can assume $c \geq 3$, since under our hypotheses $c = 2$ would yield the triplet $(2, 2, 2)$ which gives $N(2, 2, 2) = 2$; let us now consider these hyperbolas in the plane (a, b):

$$Q_1 : a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - abc - 5 = 0$$

$$Q_2 : ab - 2c = 0$$

thinking of c as a parameter (the figure shows the situation for $c = 12$, with Q_1 drawn in black and Q_2 drawn in red).



The origin $(a, b) = (0, 0)$ belongs to the area P_1 where $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - abc \geq 5$ if and only if $c \geq \sqrt{5}$, which is true since we have $c \geq 3$; on the other hand, $(0, 0)$ definitely belongs to the area P_2 where $ab - 2c \leq 0$.

We have to prove that if (a, b) such that $c \geq a, b \geq 0$ belongs to P_1 then it belongs to P_2 too, i.e. that (a, b) is in the greyed out area of the figure; in order to do this, it is enough to show that the two intersection points of Q_1 and Q_2 located in the first quarter have respectively ordinate and abscissa greater than or equal to c.

If we call $x = \sqrt{\frac{c^2+4c+5}{2}}$ and $y = \sqrt{\frac{c^2-4c+5}{2}}$, after some computation we obtain that these intersection points are $\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}x - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}y, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}x + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}y\right)$ and $\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}x + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}y, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}x - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}y\right)$. We have to prove that the ordinate of the first point and the abscissa of the second one (which are the same) are greater than or equal to c.

$\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{c^2 + 4c + 5} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{c^2 - 4c + 5} \geq c$ if and only if $\sqrt{c^2 + 4c + 5} + \sqrt{c^2 - 4c + 5} \geq 2c$ i.e. (after some computations) if and only if $\sqrt{(c^2 + 5)^2 - 16c^2} \geq 5 - c^2$; the hypothesis $c \geq 3$ forces the last term to be strictly negative, so we just have to prove that the argument of the square root is non-negative (which it is, as one can easily verify). □

We can now show that

Theorem 2.6. *If $N(a, b, c) \geq 3$ then (a, b, c) is prehomogeneous.*

Proof. Since $N(a, b, c)$ is castling-invariant, we can assume (a, b, c) to be minimal; moreover, we can assume $a, b, c > 1$ (if one of them is 1 then (a, b, c) is trivially prehomogeneous) and, without loss of generality, $2 \leq a \leq b \leq c$. Under these hypotheses, the previous lemma tells us that $ab \leq 2c$, i.e that $ab - c \leq c$.

If $ab - c = c$ we'd have $(a, b, c) = (a, b, \frac{ab}{2})$, but $N(a, b, \frac{ab}{2}) = 2$: in fact $N(a, b, \frac{ab}{2}) = a^2 + b^2 - \frac{a^2b^2}{4} - 2$, which is smaller than or equal to 2 if and only if $b^2(1 - \frac{a^2}{4}) + a^2 - 4 \leq 0$, and this is certainly true for $a = 2$ (in this case we obtain the triplets $(2, b, b)$); if $a \geq 3$ then $(1 - \frac{a^2}{4}) < 0$ and our claim is true as long as $b^2 \geq \frac{4-a^2}{1-\frac{a^2}{4}} = 4$, which is true by hypothesis.

We can conclude that $ab - c < c$, but since (a, b, c) is minimal it must actually be $ab - c \leq 0$; this means $-ab \geq -c$ which implies $c^2 + b^2 - abc = c^2 + b^2 + c(-ab) \geq c^2 + b^2 - c^2 = b^2 \geq 1$ since $b \geq 2$ by hypothesis. Thus (a, b, c) satisfies Kac's inequality and by proposition 1.7 it is prehomogeneous. □

The next theorem, whose proof is contained in the previous propositions, sums up what we obtained for the case n=3.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$:*

1. *If $N(a, b, c) \leq -1$ then (a, b, c) is not prehomogeneous.*
2. *If $N(a, b, c) = 0$ then (a, b, c) is prehomogeneous.*
3. *The case $N(a, b, c) = 1$ cannot happen (see proposition 2.3).*
4. *If $N(a, b, c) = 2$ then (a, b, c) is castling-equivalent to $(2, k, k)$ for a unique $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, and it is prehomogeneous if and only if $k \leq 3$.*
5. *If $N(a, b, c) \geq 3$ then (a, b, c) is prehomogeneous.*

3 The case $n \geq 4$

The necessary condition that an n-uple $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ has to satisfy to be prehomogeneous is

$$N(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \geq 0 \tag{3.1}$$

We also have two sufficient conditions, which we will state (without loss of generality) under the assumption that $a_1 \leq \cdots \leq a_n$. The stronger one is given by Kac's theorem: assuming $a_n \geq a_{n-1} \geq \prod_{i=1}^{n-2} a_i \geq 2$, it is

$$a_n^2 + a_{n-1}^2 - \prod_{i=1}^{n} a_i \geq 1 \tag{3.2}$$

The weaker one is stated in corollary 1.2, and it is

$$a_n \geq \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i \tag{3.3}$$

Quite surprisingly, in most cases an n-uple satisfying the necessary condition (3.1) also satisfies (3.3), as the following lemma shows:

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ be a minimal n-uple such that $a_i \geq 2$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $N(a_1, \dots, a_n) \geq 0$; if $n \geq 4$, there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $a_j \geq \prod_{i \neq j} a_i$. This means in particular that $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is prehomogeneous.*

Proof. Without loss of generality we can assume our n-uple to be ordered, i.e. that $2 \leq a_1 \leq \cdots \leq a_n$; this means we have to prove that $a_n \geq \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i$. Let us call $q = \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} a_i$ and see that it cannot happen that $a_n < q$:

1. If $\frac{q}{2} < a_n < q$ then $0 < q - a_n < q - \frac{q}{2} = \frac{q}{2} < a_n$ which would mean $\underline{0} < (a_1, \dots, q - a_n) < (a_1, \dots, a_n)$; but in this case $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ wouldn't be minimal, which is a contradiction. We have to conclude that $a_n \leq \frac{q}{2}$.

2. The hypothesis $2 \leq a_1 \leq \cdots \leq a_n$ allows us to write $N(a_1, \dots, a_n) \leq n a_n^2 - q a_n - n + 1 = a_n(n a_n - q) - n + 1$, and since this number is negative for $a_n \leq \frac{q}{n}$ it must be $\frac{q}{n} < a_n \leq \frac{q}{2}$.

3. Since $a_i \geq 2$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ we have $q^2 \geq 4^{n-2} a_{n-1}^2 = \frac{4^{n-2}}{n-1}(n-1) a_{n-1}^2 \geq \frac{4^{n-2}}{n-1}(a_1^2 + \cdots + a_{n-1}^2)$ (a_{n-1} being greater than or equal to a_i for every $i = 1, \dots, n-2$); we can thus write

$$N(a_1, \dots, a_n) \leq \frac{n-1}{4^{n-2}} q^2 + a_n^2 - q a_n - n + 1 \leq \frac{n-1}{4^{n-2}} q^2 + a_n^2 - q a_n$$

The discriminant of the equation on the right-hand side is $\frac{4^{n-3} - n + 1}{4^{n-3}} q^2$, which is non-negative for $n \geq 4$; this means that under our hypotheses the equation has two (distinct) roots

$$r = \frac{1}{2} \left[q \pm \sqrt{q^2 - \frac{n-1}{4^{n-3}} q^2} \right]$$

i.e.

$$r_+ = \frac{q}{2} \left[1 + \sqrt{\frac{4^{n-3} - n + 1}{4^{n-3}}} \right]$$
$$r_- = \frac{q}{2} \left[1 - \sqrt{\frac{4^{n-3} - n + 1}{4^{n-3}}} \right]$$

We have $r_+ > \frac{q}{2}$, and most importantly $r_- \geq \frac{q}{n}$ too: in fact after some computations we can see that for this last relation to hold it is enough that $4^{n-2} \geq n^2$, which is again true for $n \geq 4$. Thus we obtain $(\frac{q}{n}, \frac{q}{2}] \subseteq [r_-, r_+]$, and since for a_n in the latter interval we get $N(a_1, \dots, a_n) \leq 0$ we deduce that for $\frac{q}{n} < a_n \leq \frac{q}{2}$ we have $N(a_1, \dots, a_n) < 0$.

Since the assumption $a_n < q$ led us to a contradiction, our lemma is proved. □

This lemma solves the problem of prehomogeneity for all n-uples whose smallest element is at least two, but what if k elements are ones? Luckily, as one can easily verify, if $N(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = m$ then $N(1, \ldots, 1, a_1, \ldots, a_n) = m$ too: this allows us to tackle the prehomogeneity problem for n-uples by induction.

Theorem 3.2. *Assume $n \geq 4$ and let $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{N}$:*

1. *If $N(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \leq -1$ then $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is not prehomogeneous.*
2. *If $N(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = 0$ or $N(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = 1$ then $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is prehomogeneous.*
3. *If $N(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = 2$ then $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is castling-equivalent to either a minimal n-uple $(a'_1, \ldots, a'_n)$ whose smallest element is at least 2, in which case $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is prehomogeneous, or to a minimal n-uple of type $(1, \ldots, 1, 2, k, k)$ for a unique $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, in which case $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is prehomogeneous if and only if $k \leq 3$.*
4. *If $N(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \geq 3$ then $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is prehomogeneous.*

Proof. Throughout this proof we assume that $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is minimal and that (without loss of generality) $a_1 \leq \cdots \leq a_n$.

1. It is an immediate consequence of remark 1.

2. a) Let us start by $n = 4$. If $a_1 \geq 2$ the statement follows from lemma 3.1; if $a_1 = 1$ then $N(a_2, a_3, a_n) = 0$ too, which means, by proposition 2.1, that $(a_2, a_3, a_4) = (1, 1, 1)$ and consequently $(a_1, \ldots, a_4) = (1, 1, 1, 1)$, which is prehomogeneous.

   Let us now assume $n > 4$. If $a_1 \geq 2$ we can conclude using again lemma 3.1; if $a_1 = 1$ then $N(a_2, \ldots, a_n) = 0$ and by induction this $(n-1)$-uple is prehomogeneous, which means $(1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$ is prehomogeneous too.

   b) Let us start by $n = 4$. If $a_1 = 1$ then $N(a_2, a_3, a_n) = 1$, but this cannot happen (recall proposition 2.3); then it must be $a_1 \geq 2$, and the statement follows from lemma 3.1.

   Let us now assume $n > 4$. If $a_1 \geq 2$ we can conclude using again lemma 3.1; if $a_1 = 1$ then $N(a_2, \ldots, a_n) = 1$ and by induction this $(n-1)$-uple is prehomogeneous, which means $(1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$ is prehomogeneous too.

3. Let us start by $n = 4$. If $a_1 \geq 2$ we conclude using lemma 3.1; if $a_1 = 1$ then $N(a_2, a_3, a_4) = 2$, which means, by proposition 2.4, $(a_2, a_3, a_4) = (2, k, k)$ for a unique $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Since such a triplet is prehomogeneous if and only if $k \leq 3$ (see proposition 1.9), the same goes for $(1, 2, k, k)$.

   Let us now assume $n > 4$. If $a_1 \geq 2$ we use again lemma 3.1; if $a_1 = 1$ then $N(a_2, \ldots, a_n) = 2$, and by induction we can say that either $(a_2, \ldots, a_n)$ is prehomogeneous (in which case the same goes for $(1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$) or $(a_2, \ldots, a_n) =$

$(1, \ldots, 1, 2, k, k)$ with $k \geq 4$. In this last case $(1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) = (1, \ldots, 1, 2, k, k)$ with $k \geq 4$ and as such it is not prehomogeneous.

4. Let us start by $n = 4$. If $a_1 \geq 2$ we conclude with lemma 3.1; if $a_1 = 1$ then $N(a_2, a_3, a_4) = m \geq 3$ which means, by theorem 2.7, that (a_2, a_3, a_4) is prehomogeneous (and consequently the same goes for $(1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$).

   Let us now assume $n > 4$. If $a_1 \geq 2$ we use lemma 3.1; if $a_1 = 1$ then $N(a_2, \ldots, a_n) = m \geq 3$ and by induction we can say that $(a_2, \ldots, a_n)$ is prehomogeneous. In this case $(1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)$ is prehomogeneous too.

□

References

[BGP] I. N. Bernstein, I. M. Gel'fand, V. A. Ponomarev, Coxeter functors and Gabriel's theorem. Russian Math. Surveys **28**, 17-32, 1973

[Bra] M. C. Brambilla, Simplicity of generic Steiner bundles. *Bollettino dell'Unione Matematica Italiana, Serie 8*, Vol. **8-b**, n. 3, 723-735, 2005

[GS] D. Grayson, M. Stillman, MACAULAY2: a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at `http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/`

[Kac] V. G. Kac, Infinite roots system, representations of graphs and invariant theory. Invent. Math., **56(1)**, 57-92, 1980

[KR] H. Kraft, Ch. Riedtmann, Geometry of representations of quivers, *Representations of Algebras*. London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. **116**, 109-145, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1986

[Man] L. Manivel, Prehomogeneous spaces and projective geometry. Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino, Vol **71(1)**, 35-118, 2013

[Ott] G. Ottaviani, An introduction to the hyperdeterminant and to the rank of multidimensional matrices, in I. Peeva (ed.), Commutative Algebra, Expository Papers Dedicated to David Eisenbud on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday, 609-638, Springer, New York 2013

[Par1] P. G. Parfenov, Tensor products with a finite number of orbits. Russian Math Surveys **53**, n. 3, 635-636, 1998

[Par2] P. G. Parfenov, Orbits and their closures in the spaces $\mathbb{C}^{k_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{C}^{k_r}$. Sb. Math. **192**, no. 1-2, 89-112, 2001

[SK] M. Sato, T. Kimura, A classification of irreducible prehomogeneous vector spaces and their relative invariants. Nagoya Math. J. **65**, 1-155, 1977

[Wey] J. Weyman, Orbit classification for the representations associated to graded Lie algebras. Available at `http://folk.uio.no/ranestad/2010summerschool.pdf`

Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica "Ulisse Dini", Universitá di Firenze
Viale Morgagni 67/A, Firenze, Italy
E-mail address: federico.venturelli@hotmail.it